UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,622	01/12/2001	Karl Tryggvason	TRV 20011-2	3161

7590 10/17/2003

Richard J. Minnich
Fay, Sharpe, Fagan, Minnich & McKee
Suite 700
1100 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518

EXAMINER	
FREDMAN, JEFFREY NORMAN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1634	

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/759,622	TRYGGVASON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey Fredman	1634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cover sh t with the correspond nc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *August 15, 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *4-6,9 and 11-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *4,5,11-18 and 54* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *6,9 and 19-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 January 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claim 54 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The claim is drawn to a product which is related to the main invention as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product can be used for the detection method claimed, for DNA purification methods or for antisense therapy methods.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 54 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Sequence Rules

1. This application now complies with the Sequence rules.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 – Written Description

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 6, 9, 19-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In analysis of the claims for compliance with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the written description guidelines note regarding genus/species situations that "Satisfactory disclosure of a ``representative number'' depends on whether one of skill in the art would recognize that the applicant was in possession of the necessary common attributes or features of the elements possessed by the members of the genus in view of the species disclosed." (See: Federal Register: December 21, 1999 (Volume 64, Number 244), revised guidelines for written description.)

Claims 6, 9 and 19-53 encompass a genus of NPHS1 proteins or nucleic acids which are different from those disclosed in the specification. In particular, the specification teaches a single NPHS1 sequence, SEQ ID NO: 1 as well as a two examples of mutations of the Nephrin sequence, a deletion of 2 base pairs and a nonsense mutation. However, the claimed genus includes variants for which no written description is provided in the specification. No common element or attributes of the sequences are required by the claims, not even the presence of certain domains. No structural limitations or requirements which provide guidance on the identification of sequences which meet the functional limitation of comprising a "NPHS1" gene is provided. Further, these claims encompass alternately spliced versions of the Nphs1

proteins, as well as allelic variants of Nphs1 including insertions and mutations. The claims also encompass inactive Nphs1 precursor proteins which have a removable amino terminal end, and only the specific amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2 has been provided by the specification. No written description of alleles, of upstream or downstream regions containing additional sequence, or of alternative splice variants has been provided in the specification. In a gene that is over 4000 nucleotides in length, there are 3^{4000} (or about 3×10^{1908}) possible single point mutations alone, not including the other types of mutations. Thus, applicant has express possession of only two particular mutations of Nphs1 in a genus which comprises hundreds of millions of different possibilities.

It is important to note that even in narrow claims such as claim 50, which is drawn to the method comprising SEQ ID NO: 1, the mutations claimed are not taught. In fact, the claim clearly intends to capture mutations for which no description is provided. The only definition of the mutations is functional, in that the mutations must be in a certain exon or associated with a certain disease. However, aside from the specific mutations taught in the specification, no other mutations are described, in a genus that as noted above is immense.

It is noted in the recently decided case The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co. 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997) decision by the CAFC that

> "A definition by function, as we have previously indicated, does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what the gene does, rather than what it is. See Fiers, 984 F.2d at 1169- 71, 25 USPQ2d at

> 1605- 06 (discussing Amgen). It is only a definition of a useful result rather than a definition of what achieves that result. Many such genes may achieve that result. The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See In re Wilder, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 USPQ 369, 372- 73 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material. "

In the current situation, the definition of Nphs1 in the claims completely lacks any specific structure, and represents precisely the situation of naming a type of material which is generally known to likely exist, but, except for the two specific variants, is in the absence of knowledge of the material composition and fails to provide descriptive support for the generic claim to "a Nphs1 gene", for example.

It is noted that in Fiers v. Sugano (25 USPQ2d, 1601), the Fed. Cir. concluded that

> "...if inventor is unable to envision detailed chemical structure of DNA sequence coding for specific protein, as well as method of obtaining it, then conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, that is, until after gene has been isolated...conception of any chemical substance, requires definition of that substance other than by its functional utility."

The current situation is a definition of the compound solely but its functional utility, as a Nphs1 gene or gene deletion, without any definition of the particular variants claimed.

In the instant application, certain specific SEQ ID NOs are described. Also, in Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar (19 USPQ2d 1111, CAFC 1991), it was concluded that:

> "...applicant must also convey, with reasonable clarity to those skilled in art, that applicant, as of filing date sought, was in possession of invention,

with invention being, for purposes of "written description" inquiry, whatever is presently claimed."

In the application at the time of filing, there is no record or description which would demonstrate conception of any nucleic acids other than those expressly disclosed which comprise Nphs1 or deletions of the Nphs1 gene. Therefore, the claims fail to meet the written description requirement by encompassing sequences which are not described in the specification and which were not in possession of the Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 - Definiteness

4. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed August 15, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that substitution of "NPHS1" for "Nephrin" overcomes the written description rejection . This is not correct, since the basis for this rejection is the claim to nucleic acids and mutations which are not described in the specification. Therefore, this rejection is maintained against all of the pending claims.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Fredman whose telephone number is 703-308-6568. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 703-308-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Jeffrey Fredman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1634